

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner made the Restriction Requirement final, objected to the drawings, and rejected claims 1, 2 and 5-8 under 35 USC §102(e). In addition, the Examiner stated that claims 3 and 4 recite allowable subject matter. These objections and rejections are fully traversed below.

Claims 3, 4, 5 and 7 have been amended, and claims 1, 2, 6 and 9-20 have been cancelled from the application. In addition, new Claims 21-32 have been added to the application. Thus, claims 3-5, 7, 8 and 21-32 are currently pending.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Restriction Requirement

In the Office Action, the Examiner finalized the Restriction Requirement and proceeded to examine claims 1-8 which pertain to the elected Group (Group I). As a result, claims 9-20 were withdrawn from consideration. To expedite prosecution of this application, the non-elected claims 9-20 have been cancelled from the application.

Objection to the Drawings

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings due to apparently a feature recited in claim 6. Although the phrase “plurality of paddles” is fully supported by the original disclosure and somewhat represented in the drawings, Applicant has cancelled claim 6 from the application to expedite prosecution. It is submitted that the objection to the drawings is now moot and therefore should be withdrawn.

Rejection to Claims 1, 2 and 5-8 under 35 USC §102(e)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2 and 5-8 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Noda et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,341,889, and rejected claims 1, 7 and 8 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Lande, U.S. Patent No. 5,829,344. These rejections are fully traversed below.

To expedite prosecution, claims 1, 2 and 6 have been cancelled. In addition, claims 3 and 4 have been amended to place them in substantially independent form. Accordingly, since the Examiner previously stated that claims 3 and 4 recite allowable subject matter, it is submitted that claims 3 and 4 as rewritten are in condition for allowance. Furthermore, the amendments to

claims 5 and 7 simply alter the dependency such that they depend from 4. Still further, the newly added claims (claims 21-32) also depend from one of claims 3 and 4 and therefore are also in condition for allowance. Notwithstanding, it should be understood that the amendments to the claims and the cancellation of other claims should not be deemed as an acquiescence, admission or agreement to the Examiner's rejection.

Based on the foregoing, the Examiner's rejection in view of the prior art is moot given the amendments made to expedite prosecution. Hence, it is submitted that claims 3-5, 7, 8 and 21-32 are in condition for allowance.

Summary

It is submitted that claims 3-5, 7, 8 and 21-32 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0388.

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



C. Douglass Thomas
Reg. No. 32,947

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
Telephone: (650) 961-8300